1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
9		
10	JULIET SIRISU SARIOL,	CASE NO. C16-0835JLR
11	Appellant,	ORDER
12	V.	
13	K. MICHAEL FITZGERALD,	
14	Appellee.	
15	Before the court is <i>pro se</i> Appellant Juliet Sirisu Sariol's "[e]mergency [m]otion to	
16	[v]acate and request to enter [o]bjection from the [d]enial [o]rder of [i]nterim [r]elief."	
17	(Mot. (Dkt. # 38).) Liberally construed, the motion appears to ask the court to reconsider	
18	its December 17, 2018, order denying Ms. Sariol's earlier "emergency motion" for	
19	preliminary injunctive relief. (See 12/12/18 Mot. (Dkt. # 34); 12/17/18 Order (Dkt.	
20	# 36).)	
21	Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR	
22	7(h)(1). The court will ordinarily deny a motion for reconsideration unless there is a	

showing of (a) manifest error in the prior ruling, or (b) facts or legal authority which through reasonable diligence could not have been brought to the attention of the court earlier. Id. Ms. Sariol fails to make either showing. Apart from Ms. Sariol's request that the court "[v]acate" its December 17, 2018, order (Mot. at 3), the motion is almost entirely incomprehensible. Moreover, to the extent Ms. Sariol seeks reconsideration of the court's December 17, 2018, order, her motion is untimely because it was filed more than 14 days after that order was entered. See Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h)(2); (see also 12/17/18 Order).

For the foregoing reasons, the court DENIES Ms. Sariol's emergency motion to vacate (Dkt. #38), which the court construes as a motion for reconsideration. Further, the court DIRECTS the Clerk to refrain from placing any future filings by Ms. Sariol on the docket for this case, unless the filing is a notice of appeal. If Ms. Sariol wishes to assert a new claim for relief, she must open a new matter.

m R. Plut

The Honorable James L. Robart

U.S. District Court Judge

Dated this 9th day of January, 2019.

21

22